

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 6-15, 18-28, 31-36 and 39-42 are presently pending. Claims 1, 7-12, 14-15, 18, 24-26, 31-33 and 42 have been amended. No claims have been added, canceled or withdrawn. Claims 1, 7, 10, 11, 15, 18, 24, 31 and 42 are independent.

Statement of Substance of Interview

The Examiner graciously talked with me, the undersigned representative for the Applicant, on January 13, 2009. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such open communication is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited references, namely Bladow and Lu. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed several possible clarifying amendments.

The Examiner was receptive to the proposals; however, the Examiner indicated that he would need to review the cited art more carefully and/or do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

Formal Request for an Interview

If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, and if the Examiner feels that further discussion of the claims or the invention would advance prosecution of the application, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me, the undersigned representative for the Applicant, so that we can discuss this matter to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

Claim Amendments

Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 7-12, 14-15, 18, 24-26, 31-33 and 42 herein. Applicant amends these claims to clarify the claimed features. These amendments are fully supported by the original specification. For example, support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the specification, e.g., at least at page 10, lines 1-6 and 23-30, and page 11, line 8 through page 13, line 22. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 6-15, 18-28, 31-36 and 39-42 under § 103. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not made a prima facie case showing that the rejected claims are obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references alone or in combination:

- **Bladow:** *Bladow, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,115,040 (issued September 5, 2000); and
- **Lu:** *Lu, et al.*, US Patent No. 6,100,918 (issued August 8, 2000).

Overview of the Application

The Application relates to a technology that facilitates automatic log out of multiple affiliated websites following an initial authentication. Following the authentication, a list of the sites that a user visits during a session is maintained. When the user selects a logout link on any affiliated server site or on the login server, the user is directed to a logout page on the login server. The login server displays a logout page that explains to the user that they are about to be logged out of each affiliated server. Under one implementation, the logout page contains image tags for each of the affiliated servers having sites listed in the list of sites. The image tag points to a URL hosted at each affiliated server that

expires any related cookies that have been stored through the user's browser, whereby the logout is carried out.

Cited References

The Examiner cites Bladow as the primary reference in the obviousness-based rejections. The Examiner cites Lu as a secondary reference in the obviousness-based rejections.

Bladow

Bladow describes a technology for an integrated system of user interfaces for communicating with remote services. A backplane architecture controls and manages the user interfaces by instantiating, launching, overseeing and closing the user interfaces associated with a plurality of applications residing in a remote server. Each application communicates with one another and with the backplane via messaging interfaces. The backplane provides a single uniform user authentication procedure during logon for the user interfaces and also provides session management for the duration of the user's session.

Lu

Lu describes a technology for a video conferencing system that includes a plurality of customer stations selectively coupled with at least one local video conferencing station that routes service requests from the customer stations to a

remote server computer. The server computer, in turn, activates a pager to provide the service request including data identifying the requesting customer station to a service provider. In response, the service provider originates video conferencing traffic from a selected remote video conferencing station using the identifying data. In response, the remote conferencing station originates a call over the network to the local station and provides originating video conferencing traffic to the local station. The local station routes the video traffic to the selected customer station.

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

Based upon Bladow in view of Lu

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 6-15, 18-28, 31-36 and 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bladow in view of Lu. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claims 1 and 7

Applicant submits that Bladow combined with Lu does not render claim 1 obvious because Bladow, Lu, and the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in combination do not teach or suggest the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

providing a first cookie to a browser on the computer system being used by the user, the first cookie maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user;

receiving one or more second cookies at the browser as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following the authentication, the second cookies containing data associated with the corresponding affiliated servers;

selecting a single logout link via the browser, wherein the logout link is contained on any of the sites that the user has visited on the affiliated servers;

as a result of the selecting, issuing by the browser a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers based on the list maintained with the first cookie;

in response to the request for data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout;

in response to receiving the cookie setting information by the browser, clearing the second cookies from the browser by changing settings of the second cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information, wherein the user is logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication by selection of the single logout link.

Page 2 of the Office Action indicates that a first cookie maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user is taught by Bladow at col. 17, lines 42-49. However, Applicant respectfully notes that this portion of Bladow reads as follows:

When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server 1344. The Web server 1344 then connects to the cookiejar server 1352 and requests logoff for the session as shown at 1450. The cookiejar server 1352 identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie. After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar 1352 sends a logoff status to the Web server 1344, which returns the status to the client platform.

Thus, Bladow fails to teach or suggest providing a first cookie maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user, as recited in Applicant's claim 1. Instead, Bladow discusses that a logoff request is sent to the Web server. The Web server connects to the cookiejar server and requests logoff for the session. The cookie jar server identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no discussion or suggestion in Bladow of a first cookie maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following an authentication of the user, as recited in Applicant's claim 1. Furthermore, Lu provides no disclosure relating to cookies, and thus, Lu fails to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow pointed out above. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Bladow combined with Lu or the other art of record for this reason.

In addition, Bladow fails to teach or suggest, as a result of selecting a single logout link, issuing by the browser a request for data from the affiliated servers based on the list maintained with the first cookie, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Bladow describes that the web server receiving the logoff request connects to the cookiejar server 1352 and requests logoff for the session (col. 17, lines 43-45). Thus, Bladow does not teach or suggest a browser that issues a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers as a result of selecting the single logout link.

Further, Bladow does not teach or suggest, in response to the request for obtaining data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful

logout. Instead, Bladow merely discusses that the cookiejar server deletes a cookie for the session. The recited portion of Bladow does not teach or suggest sending cookie setting information to a browser or sending an image to a browser. Instead, the recited portion of Bladow discusses that the cookie jar server identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie (col. 17, lines 45-46). As is apparent from col. 16, line 51, through col. 17, line 40, Bladow is referring to cookies maintained at the cookiejar 1352, not cookies on a browser. See, e.g., col. 17, lines 13-18, which reads as follows:

When a connection is established with the cookiejar 1352, the Web server 1344 makes a request for the entitlements for a given session, as shown at 1450. The cookiejar 1352 goes through its stored list of cookies, identifies the cookie for the session and returns the cookie to the Web server 1344 also shown at 1450 (emphasis added).

Consequently, Bladow does not teach or suggest, in response to the request for obtaining data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout, as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

Additionally, Lu fails to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow discussed above. Lu is directed to a video conferencing system, and Lu discusses that a server computer provides a login/logout system for service providers through internet web pages (col. 3, lines 25-27). Through this system, a service provider can indicate availability for providing video conferencing services (col. 3, lines 27-29). Upon successful login/logout, the server computer sends a pager notification to the service provider for confirmation (col. 3, lines 29-31). Thus,

Lu does not teach or suggest, in response to selecting the single logout link, issuing by the browser a request for obtaining data from the affiliated servers based on the list maintained with the first cookie, or in response to the request for data issued by the browser, sending, by the affiliated servers, to the browser, cookie setting information and an image which is indicative of successful logout; as recited in Applicant's claim 1.

It is axiomatic that if neither of the cited references teach or suggest a limitation of Applicant's claim, then the combination thereof also cannot be said to teach that limitation. Consequently, the combination of Bladow with Lu does not teach or suggest Applicant's claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that this claim is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent claim 7 includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, and is allowable under a similar rationale. Accordingly, Applicant submits that this claim is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claims 10, 11, 15 and 24

Applicant submits that Bladow combined with Lu does not render claim 10 obvious because Bladow, Lu, and the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in combination do not teach or suggest the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

receiving one or more cookies at a browser on the computer system as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user, wherein the one or more cookies contain data provided to the browser from corresponding one or more affiliated servers;

requesting a logout page via the browser, wherein a logout link to the logout page is contained on at least one site that the user has visited on an affiliated server following the authentication of the user;

providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following the authentication;

calling by the browser, during rendering of the logout page by the browser, the link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated server;

sending cookie setting information from each affiliated server to the browser in response to receiving the call from the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies.

Pages 4-5 of the Office Action indicate that requesting a logout page is taught by Bladow at col. 17, lines 42-49. However, as discussed above with respect to claim 1, this portion of Bladow merely discusses that when a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server. The Web server then connects to the cookiejar server and requests logoff for the session. The cookiejar server identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie. After deleting the cookie, the cookiejar server sends a logoff status to the Web server, which returns the status to the client platform. Thus, this portion of Bladow does not teach or suggest a request for a logout page.

Further, the recited portion of Bladow fails to teach or suggest providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following the authentication, or calling by the browser, during rendering of the logout page by the browser, the link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated server, as recited in Applicant's claim 10. Instead, Bladow describes that when a customer wants to logoff, the web server connects to the cookiejar server and requests logoff for the session (col. 17, lines 41-49).

Additionally, Bladow fails to teach or suggest sending cookie setting information from each affiliated server to the browser in response to receiving the call from the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies, as recited in Applicant's claim 10. Instead, the recited portion of Bladow discusses that the cookie jar server identifies the cookie for the session and deletes the cookie in response to a request from the Web server (col. 17, lines 41-46). Further, as discussed above, it is apparent from col. 16, line 51, through col. 17, line 40, that Bladow is referring to deleting cookies maintained at the cookiejar 1352, not cookies on a browser. Accordingly, Bladow fails to teach or suggest requesting a logout page via the browser, wherein a logout link to the logout page is contained on at least one site that the user has visited on an affiliated server following the authentication of the use, as recited in claim 10. Bladow further fails to teach or suggest providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following the authentication, as also recited in claim 10. Bladow further fails to teach or suggest calling by the browser, during rendering of the logout page by the browser, the link to the

expire cookies page on each affiliated server, as also recited in claim 10. Bladow further fails to teach or suggest sending cookie setting information from each affiliated server to the browser in response to receiving the call from the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies, as also recited in Applicant's claim 10.

Lu fails to make up for the shortcomings in Bladow discussed above. Lu is directed to a video conferencing system, and Lu discusses that a server computer provides a login/logout system for service providers through internet web pages (col. 3, lines 25-27). Through this system, a service provider can indicate availability for providing video conferencing services (col. 3, lines 27-29). Upon successful login/logout, the server computer sends a pager notification to the service provider for confirmation (col. 3, lines 29-31).

The Office Action cites Lu in the rejections of independent claims 10, 11 and 15 for the proposition of teaching the use of an image to verify that logout has been completed. However, Applicant respectfully notes that independent claims 10, 11 and 15 do not currently include a recitation of an image, and these claims did not previously include a recitation of an image in the prior listing of claims submitted with the last response.

Thus, Lu combined with Bladow still does not teach or suggest requesting a logout page via the browser, wherein a logout link to the logout page is contained on at least one site that the user has visited on an affiliated server following the authentication of the use, or providing a link to an expire cookies page hosted on each affiliated server having a site visited by the user following

the authentication, or calling by the browser, during rendering of the logout page by the browser, the link to the expire cookies page on each affiliated server, or sending cookie setting information from each affiliated server to the browser in response to receiving the call from the browser, the cookie setting information changing settings of the cookies to cause the browser to expire the cookies, as recited in Applicant's claim 10. Thus, claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent claims 11, 15 and 24 include limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 10, and are allowable under a similar rationale. Accordingly, Applicant submits that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claims 18 and 31

Applicant submits that Bladow combined with Lu does not render claim 18 obvious because Bladow, Lu, and the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in combination do not teach or suggest the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

receiving one or more cookies at the browser as a user visits sites on the affiliated servers following an authentication of the user by an authentication server, wherein the one or more cookies contain data provided to the browser from the authentication server;

requesting a logout page from the authentication server by selecting a logout link, wherein the logout link is on at least one site on the affiliated domain servers that a user of the browser has visited following the authentication;

receiving image tags from the authentication server with the logout page, each image tag causing the browser to fetch an image from a URL identified by the image tag during rendering of the logout page;

in response to the image tags, issuing get image requests to the URLs identified by the image tags;

receiving cookie setting information and images at the browser from the affiliated domain servers hosting the URLs identified by the image tags in response to the get image requests, the cookie setting information clearing cookies identified by responses to the get image requests, wherein the clearing is carried out by changing settings of the cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information; and

rendering the images received with the cookie setting information in the responses from the affiliated domain servers for inclusion in the logout page displayed by the browser.

As discussed above with respect to claim 10, the combination of Bladow and Lu does not teach or suggest requesting a logout page. Accordingly, claim 18 is allowable for this aspect.

Additionally, the combination of Bladow with Lu fails to teach or suggest receiving image tags from the authentication server with the logout page, each image tag causing the browser to fetch an image from a URL identified by the image tag during rendering of the logout page, as recited in claim 18. Bladow

further fails to teach or suggest, in response to the image tags, issuing get image requests to the URLs identified by the image tags, as recited in amended claim 18.

Pages 5-6 of the Office Action indicate that this aspect of Applicant's invention is taught by Bladow at col. 17, lines 42-49. However, as discussed above, this portion of Bladow merely discusses that when a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the web server. The web server then connects to the cookiejar server and requests logoff for the session. Thus, Bladow fails to teach or suggest receiving image tags from the authentication server with the logout page, or issuing get image requests to URLs identified by the image tags, as recited in Applicant's claim 18.

Bladow further fails to teach or suggest receiving cookie setting information and images at the browser from the affiliated domain servers hosting the URLs identified by the image tags in response to the get image requests, the cookie setting information clearing cookies identified by responses to the get image requests, wherein the clearing is carried out by changing settings of the cookies in accordance with the cookie setting information, or rendering the images received with the cookie setting information in the responses from the affiliated domain servers for inclusion in the logout page displayed by the browser, as also recited in Applicant's claim 18. As discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 10, Lu fails to make up for these shortcomings in Bladow.

Consequently, the combination of Bladow with Lu and/or the other art of record does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features Applicant's

claim 18. Thus, Applicant submits that this claim is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent claim 31 includes limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 18, and is allowable under a similar rationale. Accordingly, Applicant submits that this claim is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 42

Applicant submits that Bladow combined with Lu does not render claim 42 obvious because Bladow, Lu, and the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in combination do not teach or suggest the following elements as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

authenticating a user to visit sites on the affiliated servers by an authentication server associated with the affiliated servers;

providing a first cookie to a browser being used by the user, the first cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication of the user, wherein as the user visits sites on the affiliated servers following the authentication, second cookies containing data associated with the corresponding affiliated servers are stored by the browser;

selecting, by the user via the browser, a single logout link, wherein the logout link is contained on any site that the user has visited on the affiliated servers or the authentication server following the authentication;

receiving the selection of the logout link at the authentication server;

generating a plurality of image tags based on the first cookie maintaining the list of sites visited following the authentication, each image tag corresponding to one of the affiliated servers;

providing the image tags in a logout page to be rendered by the browser;

rendering the logout page on the browser of the user;

in response to encountering the image tags in the logout page by the browser, generating a plurality of image requests by the browser during rendering of the logout page based on the list of affiliated servers maintained by the first cookie, each image request corresponding to one of the affiliated servers listed in the list of affiliated servers;

sending the image requests by the browser to URLs hosted by the corresponding affiliated servers, wherein each URL is for an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information and an image to the browser;

in response to sending the image requests, receiving at the browser from each affiliated server receiving the image request, an image identified by the image request and cookie setting information;

changing settings of the second cookies in response to the cookie setting information to cause the second cookies to be expired by the browser, wherein expiration of the second cookies causes the user to be logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication;

completing rendering of the logout page by the browser by incorporating the images received from the affiliated servers in the rendered logout page.

For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Bladow combined with Lu does not teach or suggest providing a first cookie to a browser being used by the user, the first cookie for maintaining a list of affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication of the user, as recited in Applicant's claim 42. Accordingly, claim 42 is allowable for this reason.

For the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 10, Applicant respectfully submits that Bladow combined with Lu does not teach or suggest sending the image requests by the browser to URLs hosted by the corresponding affiliated servers, wherein each URL is for an expire cookies page on each affiliated server that, when called by the browser, causes each affiliated server to clear cookies on the browser by sending cookie setting information and an image to the browser, as recited in Applicant's claim 42. Accordingly, claim 42 is also allowable for these reasons.

For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 18, Applicant respectfully submits that Bladow combined with Lu does not teach or suggest generating a plurality of image tags based on the first cookie maintaining the list of sites visited following the authentication, each image tag corresponding to one of the affiliated servers, providing the image tags in a logout page to be rendered by the browser, or rendering the logout page on the browser of the

user, as recited in Applicant's claim 42. Accordingly, claim 42 is allowable for these reasons as well.

For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Bladow combined with Lu does not teach or suggest, in response to sending the image requests, receiving at the browser from each affiliated server receiving the image request, an image identified by the image request and cookie setting information, or changing settings of the second cookies in response to the cookie setting information to cause the second cookies to be expired by the browser, wherein expiration of the second cookies causes the user to be logged out of the affiliated servers having sites visited by the user following the authentication, as recited in Applicant's claim 42. Accordingly, claim 42 is allowable for this reason.

Additionally, claim 42 includes completing rendering of the logout page by the browser by incorporating the images received from the affiliated servers in the rendered logout page. This aspect is neither taught, nor suggested by Bladow, Lu, or the other art of record, whether taken singly or in combination. Accordingly, claim 42 is also allowable for this aspect.

For the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that Bladow combined with Lu and/or the other art of record does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features Applicant's claim 42. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that this claim is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable at least for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call or email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

_____/Colin D. Barnitz/_____

Dated: January 26, 2009

Colin D. Barnitz (colin@leehayes.com)

Registration No. 35061

Emmanuel A. Rivera

Reviewer/Supervisor (emmanuel@leehayes.com)

Registration No. 45760

Customer No. **22801**

Telephone: (512) 505-8162

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com